

1 CARMEN PLAZA DE JENNINGS (SBN 091742)
JAYNE BENZ CHIPMAN (SBN 140048)
2 PLAZA DE JENNINGS & CHIPMAN LLP
1000 Marina Village Parkway, Suite 110
3 Alameda, CA 94501
Telephone: (510) 319-7080
4 Attorneys for Defendants THE FOOTHILL-DE ANZA
COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT, et al.
5
6
7
8
9

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12 SAN JOSE DIVISION

13 TABIA LEE,

14 Plaintiff,

15 vs.

16 THE FOOTHILL-DE ANZA
COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT,
17 DE ANZA COLLEGE; ALICIA CORTEZ
and THOMAS RAY, in their individual
capacities,

18 Defendant(s).
19
20

Case No. 5:23-CV-03418-NW

**DEFENDANTS' SUPPLEMENTAL CASE
MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE
STATEMENT**

21 Pursuant to the Court's February 24, 2025 Order Reassigning Case (ECF No. 75) to
22 Judge Noël Wise, Defendants to the above-entitled action submit this SUPPLEMENTAL CASE
23 MANAGEMENT STATEMENT ("SCMS"). This SCMS supplements the Joint Case
24 Management Conference Statement and Order, as modified by Judge Eumi K. Lee on February
25 12, 2025 (ECF No. 73). Subsequent to Judge Lee's February 12, 2025 Case Management Order,
26 Judge Lee granted Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Second Amended Complaint on February 23,
27 2025 (the day before the case was transferred) with leave to amend in part and without leave to
28 amend in part. See ECF No. 74. The SCMS responses by Defendants take into account the fact

the Second Amended Complaint was dismissed, that Plaintiff has 21 days to file an Amended Complaint or take other action, and Defendants will be entitled to respond.

1. Jurisdiction & Service

Plaintiff Tabia Lee's ("Plaintiff") Second Amended Complaint ("SAC"), which was dismissed by the Court on February 23, 2025, with partial leave to amend, included federal causes of action based on 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended. No issues exist regarding personal jurisdiction or venue. All parties have been served.

2. Facts

Statement By Defendants: Plaintiff Tabia Lee was hired in August 2021 as the Faculty Director of the Office of Equity, Social Justice and Multicultural Education at De Anza College, a tenure track position. Defendant Foothill-De Anza Community College District determined pursuant to the applicable procedures set forth in the California Education Code to release Plaintiff from her tenure track position for the 2023-2024 Academic Year. The nonrenewal of Plaintiff's employment to continue in a tenure track position for the 2023-2024 Academic Year, and Defendants' actions toward Plaintiff during her employment, were lawful, appropriate, and consistent with the California Education Code and the Foothill-De Anza Community College District's policies and Tenure Review procedures negotiated with its faculty union. As addressed in No. 4 below, on February 23, 2025, Judge Lee granted Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Second Amended Complaint, with leave to amend in part and without leave to amend in part. (ECF No. 74). The Court granted Plaintiff 21 days (until March 17, 2025) to file an amended complaint consistent with the Court's Order.

3. Legal Issues

The Court's February 23, 2025 Order on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Second Amended Complaint granted Plaintiff leave to amend the following limited Counts against the following Defendants:

(1) Count 1 – 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (First Amendment Free Speech Retaliation) against

Defendants Alicia Cortez and Thomas Ray in their individual capacities with respect to

one alleged speech activity of Plaintiff.

(2) Count 4 – Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000-e (Retaliation) against Defendants Foothill-De Anza Community College District and De Anza College.

4. Motions

Prior Motions: Defendants filed a Rule 12(b)(6) Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint (ECF No. 34) on October 12, 2023. On May 7, 2024, the Court granted the Motion to Dismiss and dismissed the First Amended Complaint in its entirety, with partial leave to amend. (ECF No. 51.) The Court dismissed the following Counts in the FAC without leave to amend: Count 2 (Title VI); Count 3 (Cal. Const., Art. 1, Sec. 2(a)); Count 4 (Wrongful Termination – FEHA); and Count 5 (Wrongful Termination – Cal. Const., Art. 1, Sec. (8)). The three Counts dismissed, with leave to amend, were the following : (1) First Amendment Free Speech (42 U.S.C. § 1983) (herein “First Amendment”); (2) Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S. C. § 2000-e); and (3) California’s Fair Employment and Housing Act (Gov’t Code § 12940 et seq.).

Defendants filed a Rule 12(b)(6) Motion to Dismiss the Second Amended Complaint (ECF No. 55) on June 14, 2024. On February 23, 2025, the Court granted the Motion to Dismiss and dismissed the Second Amended Complaint in its entirety, with leave to amend in part and without leave to amend in part (ECF No. 74). The Court dismissed the following Counts in the Second Amended Complaint with prejudice: Count 1 -- First Amendment Retaliation (42 U.S.C. § 1983) against the following Defendants: Patrick Ahrens, Laura Casas, Pearl Chang, Peter Landsberger, Lee Lambert, Gilbert Wong, Christina Espinosa-Pieb, Lydia Hearn and Lloyd Holmes; Count 2 – First Amendment Censorship (42 U.S. C. § 1983); Count 3 – Title VII Hostile Work Environment; and Count 5 – FEHA. The two Counts dismissed, with leave to amend as to certain Defendants, were the following: Count 1 – First Amendment Retaliation (42 U.S.C. § 1983) against Alicia Cortez and Thomas Ray in their individual capacities; and

Count 4 – Title VII Retaliation against the District and De Anza College.

Anticipated Motions: Defendants anticipate, as appropriate given the status of the case, filing additional motions including a motion for summary judgment/adjudication.

5. Amendment of Pleadings

The Court’s February 23, 2025 Order granted Plaintiff 21 days to file an Amended Complaint.

6. Evidence Preservation

The parties have not yet met and conferred pursuant to Rule 26(f) regarding reasonable and appropriate steps taken to preserve evidence relevant to the issues reasonably evident in this action and reviewed the Guidelines Relating to the Discovery of Electronically Stored Information (“ESI Guidelines”) as the March 5, 2025 deadline for so-doing previously set by the Court was after the Court’s February 23, 2025 Order dismissing the Second Amended Complaint and before the expiration of the 21 days within which the Court granted leave to amend which expires March 17, 2025.

7. Disclosures

As addressed in No. 6 immediately above, the parties have not yet met and conferred pursuant to Rule 12(f) given the absence of a pending Amended Complaint. The case is not subject to General Order Nos. 56 or 71.

8. Discovery

No discovery has been conducted to date. As addressed in No. 6 above, the Court’s February 23, 2025 Order granted Plaintiff 21 days to file an Amended Complaint.

9. Class Actions

This case is not a class action.

10. Related Cases

Defendants are not aware of any related cases.

1 **11. Relief**

2 The Court's February 23, 2025 Order granted Plaintiff 21 days to file an Amended
3 Complaint.

4 **12. Settlement and ADR**

5 The parties have not engaged in any settlement discussions at this juncture in the case.
6 The Court continued the ADR Certification deadline on October 30, 2024 with a new date
7 eventually set by the Court in February 2025 for March 5, 2025. The parties have not met and
8 conferred about ADR or submitted any ADR Certification because the March 5, 2025 deadline
9 for Certification was after the Court's February 23, 2025 Order dismissing the Second
10 Amended Complaint and before the expiration of the 21 days within which the Court granted
11 leave to file an amended complaint (March 17, 2025).

12 **13. Other References**

13 Defendants do not agree that this case is suitable for reference to binding arbitration, a
14 special master, or the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation.

15 **14. Narrowing of Issues**

16 At this juncture, given the Court's February 23, 2025 Order, Defendants are not able to
17 identify any other ways to potentially narrow issues or otherwise expedite resolution of issues
18 most consequential to this case.

19 **15. Scheduling**

20 Defendants propose that the parties submit another Supplemental Case Management
21 Conference Statement addressing scheduling, as appropriate given the status of the case, of the
22 Rule 12(f) meet and confer and the ADR Certification as addressed in Nos. 6, 7 and 12 above.
23 The other future case management conference dates set by the Court in the February 12, 2025
24 Order (ECF No. 73) may become an issue depending on the status of the case.

25
26 **16. Trial**

27 Plaintiff has demanded a jury trial. Defendants propose that they submit, if appropriate,
28 on a date determined by the Court at such time as the pleadings are closed, a Supplemental

Case Management Statement addressing the expected length of trial.

17. Disclosure of Non-party Interested Entities or Persons

Defendants have not filed the required Certifications of Interested Entities and Persons at this juncture given the status of the case and the parties. However, no such entities or persons have been identified at this time by Defendants.

18. Professional Conduct

Attorneys of record for Defendants have reviewed the Guidelines for Professional Conduct for the Northern District of California.

19. Other

Defendants believe that this statement addresses all pertinent matters at this juncture, so as to facilitate the just, speedy and inexpensive disposition of this matter.

20. Additional Information Requested In The February 24, 2025 Order Transferring Case

(i) List Or Description Of Parties: Plaintiff: Tabia Lee. Defendants: Foothill-De Anza Community College District, De Anza College, Alicia Cortez and Thomas Ray.

(ii) Summary of Claims: See No. 4 above.

(iii) Brief Procedural History of Case:

- *July 10, 2023* – Initial Complaint filed by Plaintiff.
- *September 25, 2023* – Amended Complaint filed by Plaintiff per stipulation of the parties.
- *October 12, 2023* – Motion to Dismiss First Amended Complaint filed by all Defendants.
- *May 7, 2024* – Court (Judge P. Casey Pitts) issued an Order Granting Motion to Dismiss First Amended Complaint, with leave to amend in part.
- *May 31, 2024* – Second Amended Complaint filed by Plaintiff.
- *June 14, 2024* -- Motion to Dismiss Second Amended Complaint filed by all Defendants.

- *August 20, 2024* – Case reassigned to Judge Eumi K. Lee.
- *October 30, 2024* – Hearing on Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss Second Amended Complaint.
- *December 4, 2024* – First Case Management Conference.
- *February 12, 2025* – Modified Case Management Conference Statement and Order issued by Judge Lee.
- *February 23, 2025* – Judge Lee issued an Order Granting Motion to Dismiss the Second Amended Complaint, with leave to amend in part and without leave to amend in part.
- *February 24, 2025* – Case reassigned to Judge Noël Wise.

Dated: March 17, 2025

PLAZA DE JENNINGS & CHIPMAN LLP

By:



Carmen Plaza de Jennings
Jayne Benz Chipman

Attorneys for Defendants
THE FOOTHILL-DE ANZA
COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT et al,